62 Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

Congresses and Assemblies of the time, void of ideas, and absurd'.[1]

The poet and precursor of the Russian Slavophile current had been the Muscovite, Alexis Khomyakov, who was born in 1804, and died of cholera in 1860. Although a man of very wide and varied general culture (he invented a gun, and a new type of shell), he was deeply attached to national and religious traditions. Moving in literary and philosophical circles, which looked to the West for their standards, he felt a frenzied need for reaction. To the cosmopolitanism of ideas and to the philosophy of Schelling, with whom his contemporaries were infatuated, he opposed a new system, based on the obligation, for any nation wishing to attain its full development, to preserve its original atmosphere of faith, manners, and traditions. Thus, while the Czechs, the Croats, the Slovenes, had at first perceived in Slavism an instrument of joint solidarity and of liberation, Russia began by regarding it as a rampart against the intrusion of Western thought.

The fundamental idea of the so-called Slavophile school was this: the West was in full decay; it was up to Russia to keep herself free of all contaminations, in order to play the regenerating role assigned to her by Providence. In the history of the universe, it was the destiny of each nation to realise one aspect of human genius and to carry this realisation to its point of perfection. Ancient Greece expressed plastic beauty, Rome's mission was to realise the conception of the State, and of Law. The Christian peoples of Western Europe had developed Rationalism and its applications to actual life by giving special prominence to individualist doctrines; witness Luther's doctrine, English political Liberalism, French equalitarianism.

The late-comers in history, Russia and the other Slavonic peoples, still had a decisive role to play in the evolution of humanity—to define the social value of love and brotherhood. The Slavonic race would find, in its mentality and institutions, the necessary conditions for fulfilling this mission. All it had to do was to foster and develop its original characteristics.

That was the psychological and providential aspect of the Slavophile thesis, in which we find unconscious reminiscences of

[1] *Confession*, p. 105 *sqq.*

6: Mousset H-4 (no date) 1950 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* the Hegelian philosophical construction, whence came the
• 812 German Ultranationalist ideal, and which was now, through Khomyakov and his school (Kirejevsky, Constantin and Ivan Aksakov, Youri Samarin), to give rise to a powerful anti-Germanist reaction.

186* Khomyakov's odes constitute what we might call the epigraph
539 of Muscovite Slavophilia. They are a pathetic and prophetic appeal to Slav solidarity: 'Look Southwards over the vast steppes, and the distant West. . . . Numerous are they, in the Carpathians and in the chasm of the Balkans, numerous are our brethren, slaves of the Turk or of the German. . . . Warm them at the fire of your love, and the day will come when the eaglets, our brethren, bursting their bonds with their brazen beaks, will, in their turn, fly off, as eagles fly'. (*Ode to the Eagle,* 1832.) The *leitmotiv* of these odes is the divine mission of Russia, who is to raise up her brethren and snatch them from the oppressor's yoke. But this mission does not go beyond a moral hegemony. 'Be not proud', says the poet elsewhere, 'in your dealings with Belgrade, O Prague, capital of the Czech countries! Despise not the Bohemian sanctuary of Vychegrad, O Moscow of the gilded domes! Brothers in blood, let us all remember that we owe each other equal and fraternal affection'.

186* The Slavophile school, in its early days, had what we should
208 now call a 'bad press'. The Westernists, who then controlled the critics and moulded opinion, represented Khomyakov's
[292] friends as Chauvinists and Obscurantists. People made fun of their faith in the native virtues of the *moujik,* their extravagances in the matter of dress, the *mourmolka,* the traditional bonnet which they had adopted with the Russian costume, and especially at their illusions as to the expansion-power of Russian culture at that time. Nothing is so dangerous as a metaphor cast into the whirlpool of international life. Pushkin had one day written this unfortunate line:—

> 'Will the Slavonic streams all come and lose themselves in the Russian Ocean?'

186* That was sufficient to lend credence to the idea that Russia considered herself to have a divine mission, that of liberating her racial brethren, and grouping them around her. When the Russians spoke of 'Slavophilia', the West persisted in understanding 'Panslavism'. Yet they were two very different things.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

same problem—she was to become eventually *the* liberator, *the* protector, *the* unifier. For this reason these two expressions of the Panslavistic idea differ not only in their aims but also in their historical origins.

From the modern point of view—from the point of view of the political implications which the Panslavistic doctrine contains—the Russian aspect is, of course, much more important. Let us, therefore, devote our attention first of all to Russian Panslavism.

The direct ancestor of the Russian Panslavistic conceptions belonging to the second part of the nineteenth century is to be found in the famous school of the Muscovite Slavophils and Messianists. The formation of this school resulted from different sources, and here again one finds interweaving ramifications of Slavic and Western European thought.

If one were to enumerate the different germs of ideas, programs, currents of thought, sometimes divergent and contradictory, which brought about the actual birth of the Slavophil idea in different Slavic countries, one would be obliged first of all to stress the fact that it took place in the nineteenth century and that it was in harmony with the political atmosphere of the rest of Europe. We find its ultimate sources in a variety of places. There was, for instance, the tenet of universal brotherhood which the Masonic Societies in particular had spread at the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. To the same period belong the works of the German-Russian scholar August L. von Schloezer, the philosophies of Herder, Rousseau, and the Romantics. From the Christian standpoint a kind of Messianism came to the fore with the sentimental attachment of the Romantics to the Bible and with Bossuet's reliance upon the Hebrew prophets. Mention must also be made of the German philosophers Schelling, Fichte, and Hegel. Along with the conception of the unity of the Slav world which arose out of the studies of the European ethnographers and philologists, went the demand for the freedom of the oppressed nations—a demand proclaimed and strengthened by the French Revolution. The movement toward

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

a Slavophil philosophy was fostered by the propaganda of Czechs like Dobrovský, Kollár, and others who championed the claims of freedom for people of good will—propaganda based on affection for the national past and on Catholic conservatism which saw in the Slav world, and particularly in Orthodox Russia, a bulwark against Western Jacobinism. Finally there were many political factors to be taken into account: on one hand, the role of Russia in the Napoleonic Wars and the growing political power of Russia, which was held to be the only power able to win freedom for the Slavic nations; and on the other, the anti-Russian tendencies voiced in the Polish risings, the leaders of which considered the enemy a nest of political reactionaries and a stronghold of violence. All these elements, various and even contradictory though they were, contributed to the establishment of the Slavophil doctrine and at the same time indicated the goal which it might ultimately attain.[3] As far as the purely Russian Slavophil and hence Panslavistic doctrine is concerned, some other factors must also be taken into consideration.

I must start *ab ovo*. For several very important historical reasons the Byzantine political influence in Moscow, in the Muscovite ideology, became particularly potent. I have in mind the fall of Byzantium and some other events bound up with this great catastrophe. In connection with the more and more imminent Turkish menace, in order to save Byzantium, in order to organize a coalition against the Turks, men in the Roman Church began to consider with even more urgency the already existing concept of a possible union of the two churches; and at the Council of Florence in 1439 the union of the churches was accomplished. The whole Greek world accepted this union. The representative of the Muscovite Church at the Council, the Metropolitan Isidor, also adhered to the union; but unfortunately his adherence did not conform to sentiments at home. And when he reached Moscow, after celebrating masses in Cracow, he was confronted by com-

[3] This follows my articles, "Poland and the Slavophil Idea" published in the *Slavonic and East European Review*, London, 1928 29.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* 175 648 literary purposes. Symptomatically two of the men most actively associated with this denationalizing, Russianizing policy, were among the most prominent Slavophil or Panslav Muscovites of the day: Prince Cherkassky and Yuri Samarin, a close friend of Aksakov."[16]

186* 668 Cherkassky, Samarin, and N. A. Milyutin worked at the agrarian reform in Poland, and Cherkassky "distinguished" himself in the campaign for reuniting the Uniates with the Orthodox Church. "Samarin and Cherkassky are significant in the Panslav movement in that, unlike Aksakov or the earlier Slavophils, and unlike the professorial type, represented by Lamansky, Miller, or Grot, they were active in administration and were well-known public figures. . . . Both men are also, above all, significant as representing the transformation of the idea of Panslavism into that of Panrussianism." (*op. cit.*, *p.* 67) Characteristically enough, Samarin was, besides all the traits mentioned by Sumner, a "considerable theologian," the collaborator of Khomyakov in this field.

186* 812 It is not mere chance that I mention this trait of Samarin's personality. The Slavophil doctrine was from its very beginning deeply rooted in religious thought. The father of the Muscovite school, Ivan Kireevsky, was first of all absorbed by problems of religious and moral categories. Parallel to the pre-Romantics, the Romantics, and the German idealistic philosophers, he was primarily interested in the spiritual structure of the human personality and in the problem of perfecting it. He was fighting for the unity and entirety of the human personality and believed that the superior truth cannot be conceived by rationalism but by the entire spiritual personality in which the factors of feeling and belief were more efficient than reason. M. Gershenzon, in his book, *Istoricheskie Zapiski* (Berlin, 1932), sensationally enough stresses that Kireevsky committed a mistake which became the starting point for the whole Slavophil Doctrine. Milyukov pretends that the century-old Russian trends toward Constantinople and world domination also originated from a mistake—from an orthographic

[16] B. H. Sumner, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

mistake. I shall not try to discover whether or not Gershenzon was right. The point is that Kireevsky's example did not represent any exception. But what was the mistake? The mistake consisted in the fact that conceptions of the law of universal improvements based on a metaphysical truth led Kireevsky and all his followers to the belief that the Russian past, the Russian nation, and Russian Orthodoxy represented the incarnation of that law of universal improvement and of that metaphysical truth. These beliefs led them to their violent hatred for Peter the Great (the brother of Ivan Kireevsky, Peter Kireevsky, hated Peter the Great to such a degree that he was deeply ashamed of the fact that he himself bore the same name) and for Western Europe, and led them to the most simplified and crude philosophical interpretation of the historical development of Europe, which they based, by the way, again on European conceptions—on Guizot's triad: Roman heritage, Catholicism, and conquest. A one-sided rationalism characterized, in their opinion, modern Europe — to which they opposed Russia.

Exactly the same might be said about Samarin, who was, as I mentioned before, plunged in religious and theological speculations and whose philosophy was based on religious personalism and Providentialism. But what is striking is precisely this—that all these men, personally honest and dignified, busy with problems of individual self-perfection, demanding Christianization of international relations, immediately lost and forgot all these speculations as soon as they touched problems connected with concrete political facts. And the respect which they had for the nation, as such, was practically confined to the Russian nation alone, as without Orthodoxy the nation did not mean anything to them. On the other hand, no less characteristic of these self-perfectionists is the dissolution of the individual in their conceptions of the village community and of the choral principle—in the thesis of the Orthodox *sobornost'*. There is hidden their Achillean heel. We shall see later to what ultimate aberrations these doctrines led, for instance in the case of Leont'ev, who praised the "ignorance of the

7: Lednicki S-4 (no date) 1948 E16 Slavic Peoples E16

186* Russian people" as a guarantee against the dangers of European
812 rationalism.

3. Goldmann, Pogodin, Stur

186* The above mentioned remarks of Sumner about the role of
829 men like Samarin and Cherkassky illustrate the fact that although in the beginning the Slavophils were not always in *odore sanctitatis* in the official quarters in Petersburg, that situation changed; the government appeared ready to use some of their conceptions. However, similar arguments and weapons for the fight against Poland—sometimes even sharpened ones—were offered to the government from other sides also. We may find a fascinating example of this in the Goldmann episode.

Charles Edward Goldmann, a German and a paid agent of the Russian government, wrote two books: *Die Europäische Pentarchie*, published in 1839 and *Europa's Cabinette und Allianzen*, published in 1862, and several memoirs which he presented to the Russian government. In his writings he tried to prove that the original religion of the Poles was the eastern Greek religion, that this religion had been uprooted by the Latin priests, that the oldest Polish Christian cathedral in Gniezno had been transformed from a Greek into a Catholic one. He attacked and derided the Polish emigration: "Polish emigration?—Does not England hang it *en masse* in Canada, while it dies from starvation in the hospitable England and the French throw it as a prey to the Bedouins, to the roulette, or to the *rouge et noir?* Russia knows very well that England and France in their nobleness and magnanimity would put the emigration next to the lackeys in their state carriage."

Goldmann also gives very valuable advice to the Russian government on how to eradicate the Polish spirit. First of all, Poland must be cut from the West, and Polish scholarship must be submerged in the Russian, the Latin traditions must be uprooted, and above all the Napoleonic Codex which rules Poland must be liquidated; the other Latin institution which must be destroyed is the